

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,814	03/10/2004	Sung-Yong Kang	21C-0117	7126
23413 CANTOR CO	7590 02/12/200 I BURN I I P	EXAMINER		
20 Church Stre		CHEN, WEN YING PATTY		
22nd Floor Hartford, CT (06103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, ,			2871	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/798,814	KANG ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	WEN-YING Patty CHEN	2871		

	WEN-TING FALLY CHEN	20/1							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 17 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 T CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:									
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 									
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 57 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration take of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set of thin (n) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailting date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL									
	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AMENDMENTS									
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor 			cause						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		L below),							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 	See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).						
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):									
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s), a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 9.10.12.13 and 15.									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-8,11,14 and 16-</u> AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<u>21</u> .								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:									
	/Andrew Schechter/								
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2871							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed on Jan. 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Uehara reference (US 5659376), applicants argue that Uehara failed to disclose, teach or suggest "the particle interceptor having at least one recess." However, as set forth in the previous office action, Uehara discloses in Figure 12 a particle interceptor (element 151) having at least one recess, which is the concaved space formed between element 152 and element 151. Hence, Uehara is believed to disclose a particle interceptor having at least one recess.

Applicants further argue that Uehara failed to disclose "the second supporting member frame portion being vertically extended directly from the first supporting member frame portion fixing the fluid crystal display panel". As set forth in the previous office action, the first supporting member frame portion comprises of elements 150 and 154, and as shown in Figure 12, the second supporting member frame portion (element 152) a vertically extended directly most here from the first supporting member frame portion. The second supporting member frame portion defines a space for confining the liquid crystal display panel, thus is considered as fixing the liquid crystal display panel, thus is

With respect to the Nilbori reference (US 5508707), applicants argue that Nilbori failed to disclose, teach or suggest "the particle interceptor having at least one recess". However, as set forth in the previous office action, Nilbori discloses in Figure 19 a particle interceptor (element 8) having at least one recess, which is the space formed between the vertically extended portion of element 17 and element 8. Hence, Nilbori is believed to disclose a particle interceptor having at least one recess.

Applicants further argue that Nibori failed to disclose, teach or suggest that a side face of the liquid crystal display panel facing an inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion. However, as shown in Figure 19, the liquid crystal display panel has a side face directed in a specific direction towards the inner side face of the second supporting member frame, therefore, the argument is not persuasive, and the rejections are maintained.